



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,643	06/22/2001	Boyd G. Brower	HE0153	7125

21495 7590 11/10/2003
CORNING CABLE SYSTEMS LLC
P O BOX 489
HICKORY, NC 28603

EXAMINER

SINGH, RAMNANDAN P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2644

2

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

S.M.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,643

Applicant(s)

BROWER ET AL.

Examiner

Dr. Ramnandan Singh

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings filed on 22 June 2001 are acceptable subject to correction of the informalities indicated on the attached "Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948. In order to avoid abandonment of this application, correction is required in reply to the Office action. The correction will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9, 13-19, 24-31, 35-36, 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al [US 5,802,170].

Regarding Claim 1, Smith et al teaches a telephone network interface apparatus (i.e. a terminating device) 10 shown in Figs. 1, 2, 4 comprising a subscriber cover 12, a telephone company cover 14, a base 16, and modular devices 18 and 20 wherein the modular device 20 is commonly referred to as a customer bridge module and applied for interconnecting telephone company ("telco") wiring and subscriber telephone wiring [col. 1, lines 18-22; col. 5, line 38 to col. 6, line 29]. Further, a housing 38 (i.e. an assembly) mounted to the base has an insulation displacement contact 92 and

openings 88 are adapted to receive subscriber wires 92 [Figs. 3-10; col. 6, lines 25-45; Figs. 12-13 and 19-24; col. 7, line 42 to col. 8, line 19].

Claims 13, 24, 37 are essentially similar to Claim 1 except for a cover attached to the customer bridge. Smith et al teaches a cover 12 attached to the customer bridge 20 [col. 5, lines 46-51]

Regarding Claim 2, Smith et al teaches the customer bridge having a pair of rocker arm terminations 42 and a cam actuated termination mechanism 44 disposed therein that are movable between a closed position and an open position [Figs. 19-24; col. 6, lines 31-45].

Claims 19, 31 are essentially similar to Claim 2 and are rejected for the reasons stated above apropos of Claim 2.

Regarding Claim 3, Smith et al teaches a cover 12 attached to the customer bridge 20 [col. 5, lines 46-51].

Regarding Claims 4-6, Smith et al teaches various security arrangements of the customer bridge using security cover 142 that may include a locking slide and a subscriber padlock [col. 9, lines 24-65].

Claims 14-15, 25-27, 38-39 are essentially similar to Claims 4-6 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding Claim 7, Smith et al teaches a plug-actuated switch that engages a jack [Fig. 16; col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 31].

Claims 16, 28 are essentially similar to Claim 7 and are rejected for the reasons stated above apropos of Claim 7.

Regarding Claim 8, Smith et al teaches the network interface device 10 that may be protected for weatherproofing using sealed electrical connections and/or gels [col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 6; col. 2, lines 29-45].

Claims 9, 17-18, 29-30 are essentially similar to Claim 8 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding Claims 35-36, Smith et al teaches a customer bridge 20 comprising a protection/electronics unit 40 [Figs. 6, 11; col. 6, line 31 to col. 7, line 8; col. 2, lines 46-63].

Claim 40 is essentially similar to Claim 35 and is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos of Claim 35.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10-12, 20-23, 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Cozzens et al [US 4,793,822].

Regarding Claim 10, Smith et al does not teach expressly an internally threaded post and an externally threaded screw for the insulation displacement contact of the assembly. However, using an threaded post in conjunction with an externally threaded screw to accommodate different sizes of fixtures is well-known in the art.

Cozzens et al teaches an electrical connector for terminating conductive wires through the cooperation of a threaded screw element and a threaded and slotted terminal insulation displacement connector (IDC) [col. 1, lines 7-11; col. 2, lines 5-31]. The tubular (i.e. post) IDC terminal is internally threaded, and the screw element is externally threaded to effect wire displacement [col. 2, lines 37-43; Fig. 7; col. 3, line 52 to col. 4, line 23; col. 6, lines 6-48; col. 8, lines 40-44].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to apply the threaded IDC of Cozzens et al to Smith et al so as to accommodate a range of conductor wires [col. 6, lines 35-46].

Claims 11, 20-22, 32-33 are essentially similar to Claim 10 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding Claim 12, Smith et al teaches testing the telephone network interface apparatus using test contact 82 [Figs. 17-18; col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 31].

Claims 23, 34 are essentially similar to Claim 12 and are rejected for the reasons stated above apropos of Claim 12.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- (i) Pamart et al [US 5,450,469] , see Fig. 7 for an insulation displacement contact (IDC) mechanism;
- (ii) Meyerhoefer et al [US 5,888,085] , see NID with switchable contacts and Figs. 44, 47, 50 for operational plugs;
- (iii) Daoud [US 6,022,233] , see a lockable customer bridge, also known as a network interface device (NID) [Abstract];


- (iv) Daoud [US 5,993,243] , see network interface device [Abstract],
- (v) Daoud [US 5,993,265], see customer bridge [Abstract]; and
- (vi) Daoud [US 5,993,264], see customer bridge with assembly [Figs. 1-8].

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (703)308-6270. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester Isen can be reached on (703)-305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

Dr. Ramnandan Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2644



FORESTER W. ISEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600